

□ 1930

PRIDE IN THE UNITED STATES
CONGRESS

can float the bonds to build the schools, and it will bring down their own property taxes, if you will. Let us do that for the good of our children. That is what we are claiming to want to do in the next several days.

We can talk all we want about what has not been done. We have a few more days. This we can get done. I think we have an obligation to go for it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentlewoman. I regret to say that HMO reform is dead, and that there is no opportunity here to really deal with the Social Security issue anymore, because they have run the clock.

But at least over the next few days if we can get the budget to include these two education initiatives, the modernization of the schools and the 100,000 additional teachers, then at least we can say that we have accomplished something before this do-nothing Congress goes home. We are just going to be out there every day saying that. We are not leaving. We are not leaving this place until we get some response from the other side of the aisle on these two issues.

Again, I started off today by saying that when I was back in New Jersey in my district and I was at an event, this is what the people were talking about. I had a lot of educators there, I had a lot of elected officials on the local level, and as the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) was saying, they were saying they need to modernize their schools, and they cannot do it. They cannot get the bonding. The cost of the interest rate on the bonding is so excessive that they either cannot do it, or the taxpayers are upset because of the amount of money that is involved.

We need to address these issues. I know the gentlewoman has the dozen education initiatives that they failed to do. I wish the gentlewoman would go over that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to. This is the dirty dozen that the Congressional Republicans wanted to do to our public schools: eliminate the Department of Education; divert billions of dollars in public school funds for private school vouchers; cut school lunches for poor children; block-granting critical education programs, and when we block-grant those programs, we eliminate programs, and there is no accountability by the Governors as to where that money is being spent; ending equal opportunity in higher education; tax cuts for wealthy taxpayers who send their children to private schools; eliminating summer jobs; eliminating school-to-work; ending school interest subsidies for student loans; eliminating safe and drug free schools. That is the litany, that is the legacy of this Republican Congress.

Mr. PALLONE. Hopefully, we can get something done before we adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, before I begin and respond to a lot of things we have heard, and there is an awful lot to respond to, I want to say a couple of words about two people that were in the news today that all America needs to remember.

First of all is Clark Clifford, who was a wise man to many Presidents. He helped Harry Truman in dealing with the union crisis also certainly helped LBJ in Vietnam. He was a good public servant. He was a wise man. Any clouds that may have come over his life in his waning years certainly are insignificant compared to his public service.

Also we need to be thinking about Matthew Shepherd. He was a young college student who was brutally beaten a few days ago. I find it kind of ironic that Amnesty International this past week issued a report talking about human rights in America the same week that this happened.

While it certainly was not sanctioned by this government, I believe all of us who are public officials must do all we can to publicly condemn these type of actions. Certainly all of America's prayers need to be with Mr. Shepherd today.

There is also obviously strife in the District of Columbia as we have heard. It has always been that way, I guess, from the time that our President Adams, our second President openly loathed our third president Thomas Jefferson. This is a bit of tradition in Washington, but those two gentlemen learned how to disagree without being disagreeable.

Unfortunately, as we have heard today, that has just not been the case. We need this honest debate. There are differences. But I am continually disappointed by the tone of the rhetoric from the other side.

This is what I heard just about 15 minutes ago, quote, "the Republican majority does not care at all about America's health care, about our children's education, or about the environment." This is not quite as bad as the last session when I think I was called a Nazi because I was a Republican probably about 5 or 10 times by the minority because they disagreed with our efforts to balance the budget. This shrill rhetoric does nobody any good.

I have a question to ask. Who says I do not care about our children's educational system, when I have got two boys in public schools back in Pensacola, Florida, just because I do not believe that bureaucracies in Washington, D.C. should have more money, more power, and more authority, and just because I believe that the teachers that I meet when I take my children to

student night, to open house night at Cordova Park Elementary School, just because I have faith in the principal that oversees my children every day, just because I have more faith in local school boards than bureaucracies in Washington, D.C., does that really mean that I hate public education? Of course it does not.

But we are 3 weeks away from the election, and this shrillness. It is offensive. We also hear that we hate the environment because we do not agree with their form of regulatory burdens that they have thrown on America for over 40 years while they were in the majority.

Listen, I have got a stream in my backyard. I have got blue skies overhead. My children drink from the water supplies that Democratic parents' children drink from. Who says we do not care about the environment? Again, it is the shrillness.

They have lowered the level of public discourse, and I think it is shameful. We do not need to disparage Democrats just because they believe in a centralized bloated bureaucracy. I can disagree with them without being disagreeable.

I am not going to say that they hate their children just because their policies failed in education from 1954 to 1994. I am not going to say that they hate their grandparents because, over the past 40 years while they were in control, they did not put aside one cent for Social Security.

But after four years, we have already put a plan together to save \$1.6 trillion to save for senior citizens and keep Social Security solvent. I am not going to say that they hate senior citizens. I am just going to say that they are misidentified, that their way was the way of LBJ and FDR and generations past.

But we are going into a new era, and we need to go into that era with a bit higher public discourse. They say that we take pride in doing nothing in Washington, D.C. in this do-nothing Congress. Well, I do not want to get into this partisan wrangling, but facts are stubborn things, and the American people have been misled.

I think the American people need to hear the facts. Four years ago, when we got here, Americans had a \$250 billion deficit that was strapping them down and strapping the economy down. We had Alan Greenspan, Fed chairman, say, if we balance the budget like the Republicans are proposing in 1995, we will see unprecedented growth in America.

Four years later, we have a \$70 billion surplus the way that Washington calculates the surplus. And true to the Fed chairman's prediction, we have unprecedented growth in America. Interest rates did come down. America's economy has been stronger over the past 4 years than ever before.

Am I proud of that? Yes, I am proud of that. I am proud of the fact that we

also did something about welfare reform. We promised we would do something about welfare reform. The President promised in 1992 that we would do something about welfare reform. But when the Democrats were in control, he did not do it. When we got into control, he had to do it.

In the first 6 months, the welfare rolls of America dropped by almost 8 percent. We have a long way to go. But am I proud of the first step we took in welfare reform? Yes, I am proud, and America is proud.

Tax relief, I hear them say that they agree that we need tax relief. But I have never heard of a single tax relief bill that the Democrats have supported since we have been here, not a single one. But we gave Americans the first tax cut in 18 years and tax cuts that will help them educate their children, tax cuts that will help grow the economy, that will keep interest rates down, and have if put student loan rates at their lowest of percentage point. That helps all of Americans. Am I proud of that? Yes, I am proud of that.

Despite all of the wrangling and all of the screaming and all of the moaning about how horrible this Congress has been, the public opinion polls show that more Americans are pleased with the performance of this Congress, over 60 percent. The newspapers say it has been a historical high more than it have ever been.

So am I proud of our accomplishments, yes, I am. Am I discouraged by their rhetoric? Certainly I am. They talk about health care, about how we do not want our families to have good health care. That is insulting.

My father underwent open heart surgery a year ago. He would not have been able to afford it himself. Obviously, we have a health care system that is the best in the world. We have to improve on that and get more Americans in to have access to health care. We have to curb some of the abuses, and that is what we did when we tried to pass a health care reform bill earlier this year.

But it has never been enough. We actually heard 20 minutes ago a Member from the minority party dream wistfully, and I could not believe it, but they cannot help showing their hand sometimes, dreaming wistfully of the day when America will once again recognize that we need a single payer health care system, that we need to socialize medicine in America.

I am sorry. I thought that is what the President tried to do in 1993 and 1994. Have Americans decided in the past 3 years that they were wrong when they elected us to Congress in part because he tried to socialize one-seventh of the economy with the health of the Democrats? No.

Americans still do not want socialized health care. Even if that is what the liberal extreme left wants, we have to chart a moderate course for health care reform.

I also hear them talking about tobacco, the evils of tobacco, and how the Republican Party is fueled by greed, lust, and tobacco money. I cannot help but remember the articles that came out after the 1996 campaign that showed that, no, the Democratic National Committee did not take money from tobacco companies. Instead, they let their State parties take money from tobacco companies, and then they funneled the money to President Clinton's campaign, to the Democratic House Members' campaign, to the Democratic Senate Members' campaigns. The same campaigns where they were shaking their fist on television talking about how they hated big tobacco. They hated it so much they did not take the money directly, they had to take it under the table.

I am saying this as somebody who has not been a friend for big tobacco. I voted against tobacco subsidies before. I will do it again. I think it is bad policy for America. I think it is bad policy for the health of our children. But I also think it is bad to have this level of disingenuousness coming from the other side. Do not attack tobacco if you are taking their money under the table.

Again, we hear about Social Security; last time, we wanted to cut taxes to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. Well, I do not hear them saying anything about the \$17.1 billion that President Clinton and the Democrats want to use today to take from the Social Security Trust Fund to fund more government spending in Washington, D.C., more employment of bureaucracies, and more regulations.

The moral of the story today, it appears on October 11, 1998, is that the Democratic Party thinks it is bad to give Americans a tax cut if that takes a dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund. But if we are talking about feeding bureaucracies, making the Federal Government even fatter and bigger and more obtrusive, then that type of gutting of the Social Security surplus is okay.

Again we have inconsistencies. They just cannot seem to get their story straight. They cannot get their story straight on education either. We are the do-nothing Congress on education? I do not think so. I think we proposed one of the most dramatic bills for education reform that has been proposed here in 40 years.

We had a very radical message, a very dangerous message. The message was this, it was a message of Jefferson and Madison, it was that we are a Nation of communities, not a Nation of bureaucracies.

We had the Dollars to the Classroom Act. We said we were going to give 95 percent of the money in Washington, D.C. in education to the classrooms. That is radical in Washington, D.C. in 1998. But we are actually going to spend education money in the classrooms.

I can tell my colleagues, I have been around the classrooms in, not only my

children's classrooms, but also across my district, across this country, and then in Washington, D.C., and I can tell my colleagues the classrooms are in dire need of more money, better books, better facilities, better computers, more teachers, and smaller classroom sizes.

But we are not going to get that by keeping the money in Washington, D.C. and growing the education bureaucracy. They are very fearful that power may actually slip out of the hands of Washington bureaucracies and their allies and instead go to teachers and parents and principals.

I am fearful that that will not happen. Because, while they were in control from 1954 to 1994, we saw the educational standards and the system in this country skid at an unprecedented alarming rate.

We have got to do better. My two boys deserve it. Our children deserve it. Their children deserve it. We are not going to do that as long as we continue to fight to protect the status quo.

Let us get all the money we can get into the classrooms. We are not a do-nothing Congress. I really do not want to tread too much into this area, but I think it is necessary, because we have been attacked as being a do-nothing Congress.

I think it is important to set the record straight, that the same party that is attacking us as being a do-nothing Congress, even after we passed this historic balanced budget agreement, the economy is booming. Welfare rolls are down. The Social Security trust fund is solidified.

What we found is that we have a Democratic Party whose leader has held only two cabinet meetings in 1998. Think about that for a second. Here we are being attacked for not doing enough. The President, their President, our President has only held two cabinet meetings this entire year.

We know during the first cabinet meeting, he used it to mislead his cabinet officers. The second cabinet meeting was to apologize for misleading his cabinet officers.

I think we deserve better. I think we deserve more honesty from our leaders when they attack us for doing nothing to actually put that mirror up and see what they have done.

Instead of vetoing every single education proposal that we have sent to the White House, seven education proposals, every single one of them vetoed, I think they need to turn around and start being constructive.

□ 1945

They are saying they are going to keep us in town. That is fine. We will stay in town. We will debate the issue of education. We will debate who has done better on saving the Social Security trust fund. We will debate on who has done better by balancing the budget for the first time in a generation. We will debate about who has done a better job cutting taxes for the American

people. We will do that as long as they want to do it.

The American people are on our side. They are the ones that need to worry about getting back to their district and justifying what has been going on with the Democratic Party over the past 7, 8, 9 months.

In a free and open debate, in what Thomas Jefferson called the free marketplace of ideas, we are going to win every time, because in the end we believe like Jefferson, Madison, Washington and our Founding Fathers, that the genius of America does not lie in Congress or in the Senate or the White House or in bureaucracies across Washington, D.C. but, instead, the genius of America rests in communities.

We are a Nation of communities. We are a Nation of individuals. We are a Nation of people that actually know pretty well how to govern ourselves and how to educate our children and how to take care of our parents and grandparents.

What is at the bottom of their argument? Regrettably, it is the paternalistic belief that they know how to educate my children better than I do, they know how to take care of my children and my parents' and my grandparents' health better than local governments and State governments. And they know how to spend our checks that we get from working better than we know how to spend our money. It is total arrogance. It is the arrogance that drove them out of power in 1994, and it is the arrogance that is going to haunt them again three weeks from now.

I think we can do better. I think we can continue fighting to do the things that we have been doing. I think we need to ask the President to become engaged in this process, to stop calling out focus groups and pollsters and saying, how can I save myself from this political crisis that I find myself in? We need the President of the United States to come back to Washington, to sit across the table, to negotiate instead of doing what he continues to do.

I told you that he held two cabinet meetings all year for not the best of reasons. Well, he has held over 96 fundraisers this year. In fact, tomorrow he is going to be holding a fund-raiser in Palm Beach, Florida, would we all not like to be there, and New York City. So he is going to be holding as many fundraisers tomorrow as he held cabinet meetings all year.

Is this really a President that is serious about doing the Nation's business, about reforming education and health care and Social Security and balancing the budget and cutting taxes, or is it a President who is desperately doing everything he can in his political power to hold on to his office for at least three more weeks until the midterm elections?

There are some disturbing questions to be asked that we are not going to go into. I want to talk about policy. I want to talk about education because they talked about education. I want to

talk about our great record on Social Security and keeping Social Security solvent. We want to talk about taxes. We want to talk about balancing the budget for the first time in a generation. We want to talk about doing all the things that we have done.

We will let the Committee on the Judiciary talk about the impeachment proceedings, but if they want to talk issues, we will talk issues. The American people, I get people calling up saying, you people need to do the people's business. Well, all of this that we are talking about, education, Social Security, health care, that is the people's business. That affects government. But what also affects the American people is whether they have an honest and trustworthy President and honest and trustworthy Members of Congress. And those are tough questions that have to be asked.

At the end of the process, we certainly hope that America will be stronger because of it, but it will be stronger, we know already, because of the great policy objectives that we have put forward over the past four years that have been such a success.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) who has done a fantastic job with me on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to make a brief comment associating myself with your earlier remarks. One thing, I was a little concerned that you were going to discourage them from advocating socialized medicine when, in fact, you and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and I owe a lot of our presence here, as you point out, to the fact that they advocated socialized medicine in 1993 and 1994. And I hope they continue to advocate that because it goes contrary to the American will.

I want to associate myself with two other things that you said. I think it is very important for the Speaker and anybody watching this discussion to understand. When the venom comes out of the other side's mouth and they talk about the radicals and the people who are extremely conservative, the truth is that they are talking about, if anybody else, you and me and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Do you know what? I do not take tobacco money. I sent tobacco money back. I do not even take the affiliates of tobacco money. I, too, like you am concerned about the impact of tobacco on my kids. Yet we are the class of 1994. We are supposed to be these conservatives. Who are they talking about exactly? Furthermore, they talk about education and beating on it, saying we are not doing anything. In the higher education bill, there was bill developed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) that he worked with the President on called High Hopes. Not a lot of Members in on our side advocated that. I was a cosponsor. In committee we talked together and you cast the deciding vote.

The fact is, the number one priority of the President in education would not be there if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) had not voted in committee giving them their margin of one to get it through.

We are supposed to be the terrible people. We are the people they are constantly fingering. We have reached over and tried to work together. We have tried to give them tobacco. We have tried to pass bills through here. We have tried to move the Patients' Bill of Rights and different health legislation through. What we do not see is any accommodation from the other side except venom.

I thought you did a good job of pointing that out.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I have to tell you, it has been very discouraging to see for the past four years Republicans sitting on the floor, talking on the floor and balancing the budget, cutting taxes, saving over a trillion dollars for Social Security. And from the first day that we got here, all I have seen is venomous attacks.

I remember the first day we got here, it was the Speaker's book deal, that this was somehow a horrible affront to western civilization. Then they dredged up that story about the Nazi historian and it went down hill from there. Now I am told that I do not care about my children's public education. I care very much about my children's public education, just as I care as deeply about the education of children who are south of the Anacostia River, who will not be getting to go to the schools that the President and the Vice President's children were able to go to when they were here, because the President vetoed a bill that would have given children south of the Anacostia River the same opportunity that his children had.

Now, listen, this is a tough business. I certainly am not saying that the President and the Vice President's children should not have had that opportunity, but I am saying, why do you not give the children in Anacostia and inner city Washington, D.C. the same opportunity that your children and our children have? It only seems fair.

One other thing on the radical remark. If we are radical, then so, too, are the 65 percent of Americans who agree with what we are doing. I guess the only people that are rational are those in the 35 percent minority, because they are basically saying that 65 percent of Americans are backward and dangerous and radical.

Mr. SOUDER. I, too, want to point out that I have two children in college. Both of them went through public schools, through elementary, junior high and high school. My youngest is going through public schools. I went through public schools. I get tired of people lecturing me, whose kids are in private schools, about public schools. I thought that was a very good point.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. As a public figure, I have seen that time and time

again. You have, I do not want to put a label on them but for lack of a better use of a label, liberals telling me how much I hate public schools while their children are going to private schools. I do not know about the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) but I know you and I are not country club Republicans. I know he is not either. We are not Rockefeller Republicans by any stretch. We have an awful lot more in common than a lot of those Members claiming that we hate public education. Our children are going to public schools, and I have got to tell you, I am glad every day that they are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. I want to identify with a few of your remarks. Being from Oklahoma, I went to all the public schools, all of my kids went to public school. I have, my third daughter, my youngest daughter is now a senior at Oklahoma State University. Public schools is something that we need to enhance, and nobody here is saying we should not. The question is, how many of the dollars are spent on the children and how many of the dollars are spent in the classroom and how many of the dollars are sent there for a merit raise for an outstanding teacher versus how many of the dollars are spent above that school all the way back to Washington?

The fact is only 60 percent of the dollars are getting to our children. Why should not our teachers be some of our highest paid professionals? Why? Because it is getting chewed up in administrative costs from Washington before it ever gets there.

It is interesting, not long ago they published a study done in Massachusetts, an 8th grade literacy test, 40 percent of the teachers in the State of Massachusetts could not pass an eighth grade literacy test. That is not an affront from me towards the teachers of Massachusetts, but it brings to bear the very real problem. We put the dollars in the wrong place.

If we want excellence, then we have to concentrate the dollars in the classroom. I hope you will yield me about 4 or 5 minutes. There is an area that, another area in Washington that I would like to address and just take a little break here for a minute, if I could.

It has to do with the Office of Inspector General. This is an office that was created to create a balance. The Inspector General in all the different departments in this country was designed to be a balance, to look at, to make sure, to both report to Congress and to the Secretaries that, under the laws, that each of those departments were running properly. It was established to promote economy, efficiency, effectiveness, to prevent fraud, waste and mismanagement in the programs that each of those agencies operate.

There is a particular inspector general, Ms. Susan Gaffney. She was nominated for the HUD Inspector General post in 1993 by President Clinton, was

sworn in and confirmed by the Senate. This lady is somebody we can be proud of. She is a career lawyer who has worked to expose fraud and abuse and to expose those who perpetrate and steal the very tax dollars that people bring to the operation of this government.

She has been in the housing industry since 1970. She has had the following awards: the Presidential Meritorious Rank award, the Distinguished Honor award, the Joint Financial Management Improvement award for distinguished leadership, and because of those awards, she was appointed and placed to be the watchdog over the housing programs in this country.

She came in under Secretary Cisneros' tenure and had a great relationship, developed good input and had a wonderful course, where she helped that agency control the dollars and made sure that fraud and abuse were not present.

However, I am sad to report that at this time the situation at HUD is very much different. There is no question that Secretary Cuomo and Ms. Gaffney share the same strong commitment to HUD's mission. However, the department appears very uncomfortable with the concept of an independent Inspector General who has dual reporting responsibility to both the Secretary and to this Congress.

I believe that Inspector General Gaffney wishes to do the job to the best that she can and to bring accountability to HUD, its programs and the taxpayers who support it.

Over the past couple of years a series of events suggests that there have been efforts to tarnish her superb reputation, her record and to limit her ability to do her job. I want to share some of those for the record.

Number one, the Acting General Counsel of HUD, a key aid to the Secretary, asserted that the OIG audit reports should be issued only through the Office of the Secretary, violating the laws that we have set on the books. The OIG was not authorized to have its own office of counsel. The OIG was violating its memorandum of understanding with the HUD General Counsel. These actions contradict the concept of an independent counsel and an independent Inspector General.

□ 2000

A deputy general counsel at HUD stopped a routine investigation of an Equal Employment Opportunity complaint against the Inspector General and instead contracted with two law firms outside of the agency to do a wide-ranging investigation of the complaint. A typical EEO investigation costs \$3,000. HUD is paying \$100,000 to outside lawyers for the investigation that is ongoing. Number three. On two occasions, the Secretary has cut the office of Inspector General's budget request without notification, without consultation. In February of this year, the Secretary advised Ms. Gaffney to

take care in reporting on his program initiative HUD 2020 in the OIG's semi-annual report to Congress. The Secretary stated that he was having HUD 2020 evaluated by outside private sector program consultants and their reviews would be very positive. The Secretary said that he did not want Ms. Gaffney to be humiliated by filing a report at odds with the others, regardless of what the truth was. In fact the Secretary spent \$412,000 contracting for outside reviews which the Inspector General had a parallel review going on at the same time. One of the reasons is they gave very different results. Despite authorizing language in the Inspector General Act of this government and precedent and other offices of the Inspector General throughout the government, HUD's general counsel opined that the HUD Inspector General not establish its independent personnel function without the approval of the Secretary. Congress has decisively resolved this issue by inserting language in the Senate-House conference report in the omnibus bill on the HUD's 1999 appropriation. The reason I stand here and share this with you is the apparent assault on government accountability and the apparent assault that this Inspector General is under.

When I was elected in 1994, the majority who voted for me wanted a change. They wanted sunshine, they wanted open government, they wanted less government and they wanted more efficient government. They wanted an accounting of the tax dollars that is coming out of their paycheck every day. One of the ways we achieve a goal like that is to make agencies accountable. One of the greatest assets that I have as a Congressman is the Inspector General's office. They have an expert knowledge of governmental areas and critiques of programs. I think the gentleman from Florida would agree when we have Cabinet secretaries undermining the position that was placed there to hold them accountable in the first place, that we have something very wrong ongoing. It is my charge through this House that the Secretary let the Inspector General do her job, that she would not be harassed, she would not be limited and that her exemplary record be used to make sure that our tax dollars are used in an appropriate way for those that are depending on our assistance for housing.

With that, I change the debate back. I think that is something that needs to be said. It is unfortunate that we see this many times coming out of this administration. This is not the only area where we have seen this type of coercion take place in trying to move the government in a way other than sunshine and other than light. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. Really it does fit right in with what we were talking about when we were talking about who to trust, about whether we were being misled in this debate or not and whether or not

we can trust the administration officials to properly execute and faithfully execute the laws of this country.

Mr. COBURN. One key point. We heard that the Republicans had not done anything for municipal bond funding for schools. The President vetoed a tax cut for schools in terms of their ability to float bond issues. He vetoed it from his own desk. So to claim that we did not do it, we did it, we passed it, we sent it to him and he vetoed it. So the misdirection. One of the things you do when you are on offense, if things are not going real well is you misdirect. You go a different direction. That is what we see on the football field. That is what we are seeing in terms of playing with the truth.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. It is disingenuous. It is disturbing and again whether you are talking about tobacco, whether taking tobacco money under the table, shuffling the money around in a different way; whether you are talking about health care reform where they are still dreaming of socialized medicine; if you are talking about Social Security where they claim that we are raiding the trust fund, yet they want to spend \$17.1 billion that they would take directly out of the surplus on new government programs; whether you talk about what we have done over the past 4 years in setting aside over \$1 trillion for the Social Security trust fund. Again and again it is disingenuous.

Mr. COBURN. I have a question for the gentleman. Where did the \$1.6 trillion of IOUs that are in the Social Security bank account now come from?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. The gentleman is exactly right. For 40 years the Democratic Congress borrowed, begged or stole from the general budget and got \$1.6 trillion out of the Social Security trust fund. That has changed dramatically just in the past 4 years. I have got to say, I think I would have a hard time getting on this floor and saying with a straight face that after that sorry record over 40 years, I would have a hard time pointing at somebody else that has made Social Security solvent.

Mr. SOUDER. You would at least think they would come out and say they are sorry. "We're sorry that for 40 years we did this." Maybe it would take seven speechwriters to sort through this over time to get the "sorry" part down just right. But how you can come down here and not even say you are sorry and then point at us who have just gotten here, barely 4 years in control, have balanced the budget for the first time, have a surplus actually putting the money over in Social Security and then to point at us just takes an incredible amount. At the very least you should say you are sorry.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. It depends on what the definition of "sorry" is.

Mr. COBURN. I would just make one other assumption. We have tried to slow the growth of spending. We have tried to send money back to the people

that are sending the money here. We have done that at the same time while we want to protect what money is coming into Social Security today. We always hear we cannot do it. We cannot do it. That is based on the assumption that the government is this wonderfully efficient operating machine, 110,000 IRS employees. How efficient are we that we need 110,000 IRS employees? How efficient are we at all these different Cabinet levels? How efficient are we at the Department of Education with our 6,000 employees that are mandating on the people that I represent what they will and will not do while at the same time for years the commitment to IDEA, education for those with disabilities, was promised by this government to be 40 percent of the cost. It has never come close. So what we have is school boards having to maintain a federally mandated budget program to meet the requirements of IDEA while we do not send them any money. It is called an unfunded mandate. If we would just pay our share, what we promised to send to the local school districts for IDEA, every school district in the country would average about a \$500,000 to a \$1 million increase in their budget this next year.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. That point the gentleman made, that really answers why we got elected in 1994. The question was to the American people, who do you trust? Do you trust politicians with your children's education or do you trust parents? Democrats for 40 years trusted politicians in Washington. We trusted parents. Do you trust bureaucrats at the Department of Education bureaucracy or do you trust teachers? I can tell you I know my children's two teachers. I do not know a single bureaucrat right down the street at the Department of Education. If my child is having trouble reading, or with his math, if he is having trouble in his school, I can go to the source. I do not want 60 percent of their paperwork that they have to do coming from Washington, D.C., and that is what an Ohio study said it did come from. I would rather them have that time working on lesson plans for my children. It does come back to the question of who do you trust.

If I could just say one more thing and then I will yield to the gentleman, because what he brought up at HUD reminds me of something that I found out about a year ago in this Chinese campaign finance scandal. There was an international fugitive who wanted to go to the White House and there was this pesky employee at the National Security Council that said, "No, we're not going to let an international fugitive in the White House." So the international fugitive goes to the head of the Democratic National Committee and he says, "I'm an international fugitive. They will not let me in the White House. There's this pesky woman down at NSC who won't let me in. Can you fix it?" The DNC chairman

says, "Sure. I'll call my friend at the CIA, Bob." He scribbles down on notes that were later subpoenaed, "Call CIA Bob." He called CIA Bob, he went around this government employee that was trying to keep government clean, to keep this international fugitive out of the White House and, sure enough, like a lot of other things that happened in 1996, it got murky and they did not listen to the people that were put there to be watchdogs for the White House, for the administration, for this government, for this city and for America. As a result, America suffered because of it.

Mr. COBURN. I will finish up with this. As I travel around my district, every time I encounter a teacher I ask them two questions. Is it the system that is the problem or the kids? If you could discipline in the classroom and you had the time, would our kids do better? Uniformly, every time, they say, I do not have the time to fill out the paperwork and teach the kids. I do not have the ability to instill the discipline in my classroom without the support of the structure of law to make it that I am not sued every time I try to control the environment in my classroom. So what we are really asking teachers to do is to teach with both arms tied behind them. We take half their time away filling out paperwork and then another third of their time trying to control discipline in a positive way that eliminates any ability for corporal punishment or significant absence of privileges if in fact you do not participate and behave. One of the things we have to do is dollars to the classroom. The block-granting of education programs have to go directly to the school districts. And individual school districts have to spend that money on the kids, on the teachers. The only other thing we can do is we can download the paperwork burden for our teachers, and that starts right here, by eliminating programs, eliminating departments so that paperwork is not generated in the first place. If we do that, we will see changes just like we saw in welfare reform. If we will start using a commonsense approach that is based on proper incentives and proper punishments when behaviors are not right, then we will see the kind of response in education that we all want from our public school system.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. And most importantly it will not be Washington making those decisions. It will be teachers and parents and principals who are going to be empowered for the first time in 40 years to make that decision. For the life of me, I really cannot figure out why my friends on the extreme left will not allow Washington to get out of the way and get those dollars to the classroom where they need it so desperately.

Mr. COBURN. I would just add one other thing. Somebody may think that I am one of those extreme conservative radicals. A father, a grandfather, I deliver babies on the weekend still. I love

children. But I also know if they do not have guidance and if they do not have discipline, they are going to be in trouble, and they desire that guidance. Do not ever kid yourself. They want to be disciplined in a way that will give them a future. It is natural that they would desire it.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for coming and speaking with us today. He has certainly helped out. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding. It is once again really important to remind people why on a Sunday night we are here and not with our kids and families. There is nothing going on in the negotiations right now in the budget agreement that we did not know were going to be in the final conditions 12 months ago. There is no excuse that we are here. As I would like to point out again as I did earlier, the plain truth of the matter is many of us believe our leadership has negotiated too much away. In fact when they were kids, I bet they were the kind of kids who when they went trick-or-treating and they knocked on somebody's door and said trick-or-treat and the person came to the door, they probably gave the person candy out of their pumpkin. We have in effect surrendered much of what we fought for. The plain truth of the matter is that the President has a lot of leverage right now, but why would he not want to deal? Why given the fact that we have gone through these same points, we had a shutdown in 1995, we are down to the end here, we know what things we are going to debate over, human life, over the size of government, over national testing, over census, what could possibly be a motivation?

Well, one of the things that has been much talked about in this country is a movie called "Wag the Dog." The dog, the tail wagging the dog, because of an allegation in that movie that because of a personal affair of the President he decided to start through a movie thing a war. Now, in this case clearly there is no war. I am not making any allegations that the movie in fact says anything about this President regarding that type of incident. But there is a legitimate question, is there a secondary motivation? Is there in fact a tail that wags a dog in this case where the tail says, in effect, I need a second show, I need to be able to say to the general public that there is another crisis that may take precedence over this crisis. And that in this case I think that there has been a pattern.

I want to go through, rather than talk about this President, I want to talk about a different President. I want to talk about Richard Nixon. There is a new book called Abuse of Power. Stanley Cutler has gone through the tapes which he fought through courts to try to have made public.

□ 2015

We do not have such tapes with this current President and probably given what has happened with the Nixon tapes we may not in future years. But there are some dramatic things on this that come across very similar to many of the things we have been hearing over the last few months, and I want to put some of these in the RECORD.

Number, point number one: Limiting the testimony, July 20, 1972, Bob Haldeman is talking to the President, quote, so they branded slow and temporary immunity, and he is going to cover what he knows about the Watergate stuff, which is nothing, and that gets him out of the thing. Now what they had planned to do is he was going to take the fifth, but this avoids his having to take the fifth, which is much better because he has no guilt, where under the Watergate thing he has some of the other. They just opened a new line of prosecution. We have seen that in limiting the testimony today too regarding some people in this administration.

Two: Limit the scope of the investigation. In 1972, Bob Haldeman again talking to the President: Petersen, the Justice Department, is working with that knowledge, directing the investigation along the channels that will not produce the kind of answers we do not want produced.

Now he also goes on to say that Petersen also feels that the fact that there were some lines in this case that ran to the White House is very beneficial because it slowed them down in pursuing things because they are all of the view that they do not want to indict the White House, they only want to indict the, they want to tighten up the case on that criminal act, Watergate, and limit it to the degree that they can. This is in fact exactly what the FBI director and Mr. LaBella who did the Justice Department investigation said in their memos to the Justice Department which is that the Attorney General had limited the investigation to narrow parts and would not broaden the investigation. That is in that memo that they will not release.

Number 3: We need to finish this investigation, no fishing expedition. We have been hearing that for 4 years now. On August 2, 1972, Bob Haldeman said this to Nixon. The Attorney General has ordered the director of the FBI to end the investigation. He said they have got all they need to wrap up their case that is on Watergate. The President: Do you think that is correct? Haldeman: Yes. Nixon said really it is over. Otherwise it is a fishing expedition. We have had enough of those. As the gentleman from Florida knows, we have heard over and over, fishing expedition, fishing expedition.

Number 4: Overstate the potential damage. This is in September now with the President, Haldeman and Colson. Haldeman goes on saying that you know there is a perverse theory that we walk through this this morning. We

might be better off with the Watergate story. It is not doing us much harm. The President says, yes, not much. What I mean is the harm that is done when the reporters are in a hurry too much. Haldeman: That is right, but the difference also is that the indictments will be less than anticipated rather than more. The indictments do not, see they said all along if the indictments or guilt reaches into the upper levels of the Committee on the White House, then there is the problem, and they did not at this time, which is what we have been seeing here, limiting. You say it might be this bad, and then it comes in this bad, and everybody goes, oh well, that is a relief.

Number 5: Complaints about spending too much money on the investigation, something we hear constantly. September 15, 1972, 5:27 p.m., Nixon, Haldeman and Dean, John Dean says quote, the resources that have been spent against this whole investigation to date are really incredible. It is truly a larger investigation than was conducted against the after inquiry of the JFK assassination.

Number 6: Build up expectations so news is less damaging. Here it is Nixon and Colson, and they are talking about leaking false information through a friend in the media, that the spread is going to be 19 points over McGovern, and Nixon then says 27 points, and Colson says it will sandbag him, it will sandbag him, and Nixon says sandbag them always, that is right.

Number 7: Complain about press obsession, avoiding real issues, October 13, 1972, 7:26 p.m., Nixon and Colson. Nixon: They have to attack the press for its double standard. Colson: Yes, I think that is the only way. Nixon: And by making it an all-out assault on the press for their double standard and the rest and say now come on, you are going to report this campaign, let us report what is happening.

By the way, I have been going through this book, and last night I spent 3 hours because the more I heard this the more I thought this is what we hear in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight all the time.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And you are right, it is, and you talk about the press. We have heard continued complaints about how the press is on a witch-hunt and that they are absolutely enraged that over 115 or over 120 newspapers have called for the President's resignation, and these are independent newspapers. The Philadelphia Inquirer, the Atlanta Constitution are not conservative journalists by any stretch of the imagination, but they have attacked the press as being on a witch-hunt, and the question is, I guess for a conservative, is why would the New York Times, why would the Washington Post, why would other newspapers question this President in the way they have? Why would newspapers like the Chicago Tribune, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Atlanta Constitution, call for his resignation? And I

think what you have to come to a conclusion is that there are some people that take their job very seriously, and they have integrity, and that is the decision, the journalistic decision that they have come to, and yet they get attacked just like Ken Starr gets attacked, just like anybody that has ever sort of been caught in the President's headlights gets savagely attacked.

I read a news article about a former Miss America in fear for her life and her family's life, and we have seen the hit squads that are out there, and it is just regrettable.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, as I went through this I found I have gone through seven parallels, and I found 21 minimum.

Number 8: Take advantage of the public's belief the Presidents act logically. November 1, 1972, Nixon and Erlichman. Erlichman: We do not mind being called crooks, but not stupid crooks. Nixon: We know we will never convince them on our morality, but do they think we are that dumb?

9: What is is. It is incredible, history repeating itself. December 11, 1972—

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And, excuse me, when you say what is is, you are referring to?

Mr. SOUDER. What the verb is.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. What the President said in his testimony, it depends on what your definition of is is?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, I am saying that there appears to be historical parallels.

Erlichman says the Watergate thing, I do not think there is anything to add what we have already said. Haldeman said you might re-say it. Erlichman: That nobody in the government did this thing. Haldeman: The White House. Nixon: What do you mean Watergate White House? Nobody currently in the government. Haldeman: Currently employed in the government, say currently employed. Nixon: Ever involved in the government. Erlichman: Now you have Liddy and Hunt who were at one time employed. Nixon: But while they were doing it even, while they were doing it? Erlichman: That is right. Then employed I can say. Nixon: No one who is an employee of the White House, who is an employee of the White House. Then he goes on. Erlichman says either at the time of the incidence or since. Nixon: Or since, that is what I mean, yes. Because in fact they were still employed but not at the White House. They were another branch of government. That is the precision of the is, that they had it down, that they were at the White House earlier, they are now in another branch of government, but if they said is in a certain way, it implied they weren't employed by the government.

Parallel Number 10: Everybody does a defense. January 2, 1973, Nixon and Colson. Nixon: Our democratic friends did a lot of things too and never got caught.

Number 11: This is just partisan politics. February 6, 1973, Haldeman says something we heard almost weekly.

Haldeman: As we start into the Senate thing, which is that there is a dire threat to the two party system, because for the first time in our history we have one of the political parties using the machinery of government to investigate the other political party. He is trying to get them all stirred up. It is not going to make any difference, and he does not have any illusions that it will. He is just trying to make a case that this is a totally partisan thing.

12: Coordinate the witnesses. March 6, 1973, John Dean said, well, I think the most important thing for our handling the hearings are, one, any witnesses that go up are well prepared. You know, re-reading your speech on the Hiss case again showed how effective investigators can be if one witness does not know what the other witness or there is a dichotomy between the witnesses. I want to make a direct point here. I sat in on the deposition of Jane Sherborne, and she told us how they coordinated the White House witnesses both before and after.

Number 13: Conspiracy to commit perjury, Nixon and Haldeman. Haldeman: I said that that is a conspiracy to commit perjury even if Magruder did in fact later commit perjury or even at the time he was answering Dean's questions commit perjury. He said not if Dean advised him to tell the truth, and I said what if Dean did not advise him of anything. He said, okay, I take that back, but I will simply say to you that there was a conspiracy to commit perjury and there was a conspiracy to commit justice.

14:—

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And if this can be the gentleman's last one? And if I can ask the gentleman if he can submit all of those into the RECORD, I think that will be helpful.

Mr. SOUDER. Okay, one I want to finish on then is the loyal secretary/scheduler, Nixon and Rosemary Woods. Two points, one Woods. He said says, well, I think he is too a nice man, referring to a man, but because of that fact is it even safe for me to talk on the phone? Nixon says, no, do not talk on the phone. Woods says I will call this girl today and say as soon as he gets back into town, say I need to see him. In other words, do not do it at the White House.

Then in another amazing parallel Nixon and Rosemary Woods, June 12, 1973. Nixon: You know, Rose, you know that money you got from that fellow? I would like to find a way to get that to the campaign committee. I do not know how it could be done. Woods: I am concerned. Who can hand it to them? Who can hand it to that does not have to say he has got it? It is safe and sound already. Nixon: Third parties. You never know when it is going to be investigated. Woods: But I do not think he would need it, but if so, it is out of the safe, it is in my home.

We have seen this over and over, and it is amazing parallel, and I will submit them all for the RECORD.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And I thank the gentleman, and I thank again Dr. Coburn and everybody else that has come to the floor today to debate the issues that affect Americans, to debate health care, to debate education, our firm belief that communities and teachers and parents should form the alliance to educate our children for the next generation instead of simply bureaucrats and politicians and Washington, D.C., to debate Social Security, to take pride in the fact that in just four short years we have put aside so much more to protect the solvency of the Social Security, especially when you consider that over 40 years our friends on the left did not put aside a single cent, to debate about other issues that have an impact on Americans like tax reform and tax relief for working class Americans.

I have been very surprised that over the past few years every time we try to present a tax cut that would help Americans, that would help lighten the load for parents who want to educate their children, every time we have tried to pass an educational reform that would get dollars into the classroom, every time we have tried to pass educational reforms, every time we have tried to guarantee children in the inner city of the District of Columbia south of Anacostia River and points north the same opportunity that so many people in this Chamber are able to give to their children, every single time it is met with a veto.

And so tonight on a Sunday night approaching 8:30 Eastern Daylight Time, we are here, we are ready to work. We would ask the President to hold his third Cabinet meeting of the year tomorrow and at that Cabinet meeting talk about education reform, talk about saving Social Security the way we have over the past several years, talk about continuing to balance the budget without spending \$17.1 billion in new dollars that will be taken directly out of the Social Security Trust Fund. Let us talk about the issues that affect Americans instead of running around the country talking about fund-raising and also obsessing over a shutdown strategy that does not do my children or the President's children or America's children any good.

I again thank my friends for coming to the floor and speaking tonight, and I certainly hope that the President will stay in town, work hard and give us a process that every American can be proud of.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.